03-27-06

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE der the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number 10/750,138-Conf. #9762 Filing Date December 31, 2003 First Named Inventor **David Gschneidner** Art Unit 1621 **Examiner Name** D. D. Carr Attomey Docket Number 01946/100G527-US2

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)										
X Fee Transmittal Form	Drawing(s)	After Allowance Communication to TC								
X Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences								
Amendment/Reply	X Petition	Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)								
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	Proprietary Information								
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	Status Letter								
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer	X Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):								
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund	Return Receipt Postcard								
Information Disclosure Statement	CD, Number of CD(s)									
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Landscape Table on CD									
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	Remarks	, , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>								
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53										
٨	•									
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT										
Firm Name DARBY & DARBY P	.C									
Signature										
Printed name Jason C. Chumney										
Date March 24, 2006	Reg. No.	54,781								

PTO/SB/17 (01-06)

Approved for use through 7/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL			Complete if Known							
			Application Nun	nber 1	0/750,138-Conf. #9762					
			Filing Date		December 31, 2003					
For FY 2006		First Named Inv	entor [David Gschneidner						
			Examiner Name		D. D. Carr					
Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27			Art Unit 1621			-				
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) 130.00			Attorney Docket No. 01946/100G527-US2							
METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)										
x Check Credit Card Money Order None Other (please identify):										
Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 04-0100 Deposit Account Name: Darby & Darby P.C.										
For the	above-identified dep	osit account, the D	irector is	hereby authorize	ed to: (chec	k all that apply)				
Charge fee(s) indicated below Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee										
Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayment of x Credit any overpayments fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17										
FEE CALCU	ATION (All the f	ees below are di	ie upo	n filing or may	be subjec	ct to a surcha	rge.)			
1. BASIC FILIN	G, SEARCH, AND E	XAMINATION FEI	ES		-					
	F	ILING FEES	SEA	ARCH FEES	EXAMIN	ATION FEES				
Application Ty	<u>/pe Fee (</u>	Small Entity \$) Fee (\$)	Fee (\$	Small Entity) Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fees P	aid (\$)		
Utility	300	_	500	250	200	100				
Design	200	100	100	50	130	65				
Plant	200		300	150	160	80				
Reissue	300	150	500	250	600	300				
Provisional	200	100	0	0	0	0				
2. EXCESS CL								Small Entity		
Fee Description Fee (\$)										
Each claim over 20 (including Reissues)						50	25			
Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues)						200	100			
Multiple depend	dent claims						360	180		
Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee F	Paid (\$)	Multiple Dependent C		nt Claims			
	- 31 =	× = _			<u>Fee</u>	<u>⇒(\$)</u> <u>F</u>	ee Paid (\$	1		
HP = highest num	er of total claims paid for	, if greater than 20.					-	_		
Indep. Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee F	Paid (\$)						
	-6=	x =								
_	er of independent claims	paid for, if greater than	3.					-		
3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer										
listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50										
sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).										
Total Sheet	s Extra Shee	ts <u>Number (</u>	of each a	dditional 50 or frac	tion thereof	Fee (\$)	Fee	e Paid (\$)		
100 = /50 (round up to a whole number) x =										
4. OTHER FEE(S) Fees Paid (\$)										
Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount)										
Other (e.g., late filing surcharge):/146/4 Petitions to the Director to review restriction requirement 130.00										
SUBMITTED BY										
Signature	Hen	/m _/		Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	54,781	Telephone	(212) 527	7-7700		
Name (Print/Type)					Date	Date March 24, 2006				

plication No. (if known): 10/750,138

Attorney Docket No.: 01946/100G527-US2

Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV 762808180 US in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on <u>March 24, 2006</u> Date

Nancy Joyce Simmons

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

212-527-7700

Registration Number, if applicable

Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Transmittal (1 page)
Fee Transmittal Form (1 page)
Petition Under 37 CFR 1.144 (3 pages)
Check no. 11563 in the amount of \$130.00
Return Receipt Postcard



Docket No.: 01946/100G527-US2

(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: David Gscheidner et al.

Application No.: 10/750,138

750,138 Confirmation No.: 9762

Filed: December 31, 2003 Art Unit: 1621

For: COMPOUNDS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR

DELIVERING ACTIVE AGENTS

Examiner: D. D. Carr

PETITION UNDER 37 CFR §1.144

Mail Stop Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants respectfully petition the Director to review the restriction requirement issued in the June 29, 2005 Office Action, and rejoin claims 2-12 and 15-31. The required fee of \$130 for this petition is submitted herewith. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees due with this submission to Deposit Account No. 04-0100.

Pertinent Facts of the Case

- 1) On June 29, 2005 the Examiner issued a Restriction Requirement, designating two groups. The first group contained claim 1, which was drawn to eleven compounds. The second group contained claims 2-29, and was drawn to a composition, dosage unit form, and method of using the composition. All of the claims of group II depend from claim 1.
- 2) On August 4, 2005 Applicants filed an Amendment removing ten of the eleven compounds from claim 1. Applicants also traversed the restriction requirement, arguing that the entire set of claims could be examined without serious burden on the Examiner under MPEP § 803

8

Application No.: 10/750,138 2 Docket No.: 01946/100G527-US2

3) In a September 13, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner refused to withdraw the restriction requirement and made it final. Claims 2-31 were deemed withdrawn as drawn to a non-elected invention.

- 4) In a November 17, 2005 Amendment, claims 13 and 14 were canceled. Applicants also requested that the remaining claims (claims 2-12 and 15-31) be rejoined pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 821.04(a), since these claims depend from claim 1.
- 5) In a February 24, 2006 Office Action, claim 1 was allowed and the Examiner requested cancellation of the non-elected claims. The Examiner stated that "[a] withdrawn claim that does not [sic: is not] commensurate in scope with the allowable claim will not be rejoined."

Argument

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has improperly refused rejoinder of claims 2-12 and 15-31 on the basis that these claims are not "commensurate in scope." MPEP § 821.04 (a) states:

When all claims to the nonelected invention(s) depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim, applicant <u>must</u> be advised that claims drawn to the nonelected invention have been rejoined and the restriction requirement has been withdrawn.

MPEP § 821.04(a) does not mention whether the nonelected claims are "commensurate in scope". This section does, however, require that claims drawn to nonelected inventions be rejoined if they depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim (claim 1). This is the case here.

Application No.: 10/750,138 3 Docket No.: 01946/100G527-US2

Summary

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of claims 2-12 and 15-31.

Dated: March 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Jason C. Chumney

Registration No.: 54,781

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant